

REMARKS

As an initial matter, Applicant requests that the USPTO acknowledge priority to Danish Patent Application No. 0317/98 as filed on March 9, 1998. A certified copy of the Danish priority document was submitted to the Office on May 11, 2001. Acknowledgement of Applicant's foreign priority claim and receipt of the Danish priority document by the USPTO would be most appreciated.

Should the Examiner require additional copies of the Danish priority document referenced above, the undersigned would be happy to furnish same on request.

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10-18, 20-32, 52, 53, 55, 56, 58-65, and 68-81 have been canceled herewith and new claims 82-111 have been added both as a convenience to Examiner Luckton and to point out the invention with more precision.

In particular, new claims 82 and 83 correspond to claims 68 and 81 (now cancelled) with the following exceptions: 1) new claims 82 and 83 do not recite "heteropolymeric"; 2) new claim 82 uses the phrase "consisting of" in the preamble; and 3) "ratio" language from canceled claims 68 and 81 does not appear in the new claims (it now appears in new dependent claims 110-111).

New claims 84, 85, 86, 87, 88 and 89 were written along lines of canceled claims 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, and 20, respectively.

New claims 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95 and 96 were written along lines of canceled claims 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 31, and 32 respectively.

New claims 97-103 were written along lines of the following canceled claims: 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61 and 63, respectively.

New claim 104 finds support throughout the specification including the claims as filed originally. For example, see pgs. 17-18 of the specification, bridging paragraph.

New claims 105, 106, 107, 108, and 109 were written along lines of canceled claims 73, 74, 75, 76 and 77, respectively.

New claims 110-111 find support in canceled claims 68, 81 and 53.

No new matter was added by virtue of the new claims 82-111.

Turning to the Office Action, Applicant gratefully acknowledges that the Examiner found claim 81 allowable. See pg. 2 of the Action. However, the claim was subsequently rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph at pgs. 2-3 of the Action. Applicants believe claim 68 may also be allowable since the Action does not state a reason why it should be rejected.

To address Applicant's concerns regarding claim 68 and to confirm the status of claim 81, Applicant's representative called the Examiner. In a voice-mail message dated October 20, 2003, the Examiner stated that claims 68 and 81 would be allowable if the word "heteropolymeric" was removed from each claim. In the present submission, Applicant has complied with Examiner Luckton's request by adding new claims 82 and 83 in which "heteropolymeric" is not recited. Accordingly, Applicants believe claims 82 and 83 (and claims dependent therefrom) are in condition for allowance.

Also in the October 20, 2003 voice mail message, the Examiner indicated that he would acknowledge Applicants claim to priority to the Danish Patent Application No. 0317/98 on the record. Such Action is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10-12, 20, 24-26, 29-32, 52, 53, 55, 56, 58-61, 64, 65, 70, 73-81 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph on various grounds. Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with the position taken, basis for it has been addressed by this response.

In particular, the claims have been canceled and rewritten as new claims 82-111 along lines suggested by the Examiner.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, on various grounds. Action at pgs. 2-3. Basis for each rejection has been addressed. See new claim 90, for instance.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

Claims 1 and 52 stand rejected under various sections of 35 USC 102. See pgs. 5-9 of the Action. The rejections are addressed together in the interest of brevity.

Basis for each rejection is believed to be moot. In particular, the claims have been canceled in favor of new claims 82-111. Reconsideration and withdrawal of each rejection is requested.

On pgs. 9-20, various claims have been rejected under 35 USC 103. In the interest of brevity, each basis for rejection is addressed together.

Applicants respectfully disagree with each rejection for reasons already of record. See the prior response, for example. However, it is believed that each obviousness rejection is moot in view of the present claim amendments. All the rejected claims have been canceled in favor of new claims 82-111. Reconsideration and withdrawal of each rejection are requested.

Early consideration and allowance of the above-captioned application are respectfully requested. Should any fee be needed to consider this submission including any papers attached herewith, the USPTO is authorized to charge our deposit account 04-1105 for such fee.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert L. Buchanan (Reg. 40,927)
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205
Tel. (617) 439-4444
Fax (617) 439-4170 / 7748
Customer No.: 21874

3
Date: 4 Feb 2004